



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,818	03/22/2001	Alejandro Wiechers	10003929-1	6170

7590

12/14/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
 Intellectual Property Administration  
 P.O. Box 272400  
 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

GIBBS, HEATHER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/816,818	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WIECHERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Heather D Gibbs	<b>Art Unit</b> 2622	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6 and 10-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1,3,5,10,12-13,18,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harbaugh et al (US 4,233,636).

Regarding claim 1, which is representative of claims 10,18, Harbaugh teaches a method of providing information corresponding to a document comprising the steps of: receiving scan information from a first scanner (Col 2 Lines 47-55); receiving scan information from a second scanner (Col 2 Lines 56-65); and correlating the scan information received from the first scanner with the scan information received from the second scanner (Fig 1; Col 2 Lines 66-68; Col 3 Lines 1-10).

Considering claim 5, which is representative of claims 12-13,20, Harbaugh teaches wherein the step of correlating the scan information comprises: allocating scan information from the first scanner to a first portion of memory such that scan information received from the first scanner is stored by the first portion of memory; and allocating scan information from the second scanner to a second portion of memory such that scan information received from the second scanner is stored by the second portion of memory (Fig 1; Ref 14,16).

Regarding claim 3, Harbaugh teaches wherein the scan information from the first scanner corresponds to a first document and the scan information from the second scanner

Art Unit: 2622

corresponds to a second document, and wherein the step of correlating the scan information comprises correlating the scan information such that the scan information from the first scanner is attributable to the first document and the scan information from the second scanner is attributable to the second document (Col 2 Lines 56-65)

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harbaugh in view of Sakura (US 6,122,684).

Considering claim 2, which is representative of claim 19, Harbaugh discloses the method as discussed above.

Harbaugh does not disclose expressly receiving information corresponding to a number of scanners available for scanning; receiving information corresponding to a number of documents to be scanned; enabling association of the scanners available for scanning with the documents to be scanned; and enabling scanning of the documents to be scanned with the scanners available for scanning.

Sakura discloses receiving information corresponding to a number of scanners available for scanning (Col 4 Lines 64-67; Col 5 Lines 1-7); receiving information corresponding to a number of documents to be scanned (Col 6 Lines 33-44); enabling association of the scanners available for scanning with the documents to be scanned (Col 7

Art Unit: 2622

Lines 16-26); and enabling scanning of the documents to be scanned with the scanners available for scanning (Col 5 Lines 8-38).

Harbaugh & Sakura are combinable because they are from the same scope of nature.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sakura with Harbaugh.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been as both systems provide instructions to/from a plurality of scanners.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sakura with Harbaugh to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2,19 above.

5. Claim 6,11,14,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harbaugh in view of Schwarz (WO 94/30001).

Regarding claim 6, which is representative of claims 11,14,16, Harbaugh discloses the method as discussed above.

Harbaugh does not disclose expressly providing the scan information from the first scanner to a first e-file; and providing the scan information from the second scanner to a second e-file.

Schwarz discloses providing the scan information from the first scanner to a first e-file; and providing the scan information from the second scanner to a second e-file (Page 4 Lines 1-13).

Harbaugh & Schwarz are combinable because they are from the same scope of nature.

Art Unit: 2622

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Harbaugh and Schwarz.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to transmit double-sides faxes electronically.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwarz with Harbaugh to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6,11,14,16.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claims 4,7-9 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Conclusion*


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gerritsen et al (US 4,656,343) Method and Apparatus for Processing Documents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather D Gibbs whose telephone number is 703-306-4152. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Heather D Gibbs  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

hdg



EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER